Compliments of
Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

LIBRARY
NOV 3 1924
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE

Charges Against the Government and its Officials

IN CONNECTION WITH THE

YUKON ADMINISTRATION

SPEECH

—ON THE—

AMENDMENT TO THE ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY

— BY —

SIR CHARLES TUPPER, Bart.,

HOUSE OF COMMONS, OTTAWA,

APRIL 14TH, 1899.

INDEX.

Page.

Bribery of Yukon Officials 37

Dismissal of the late Deputy Minister of the Interior 15

Government Investigation a farce 41

Liquor Permits 28

Liquor Permits, Remarkable Permit granted by Mr. Sifton to his former partner, Mr. Philps 38

Ogilvie's Instructions 40

Postal Service in the Yukon District Demoralized 33

Royalty, Development of the Yukon Country stopped by the 36

Sifton's "Fishing Expedition" in Manitoba 12

Sifton's Personal Liability of $500 paid to Mr. Howell by the Government 12

Spoils System of the Department of the Interior 15

Timber Leases, Were they Exploited for Party Purposes 35

Troops, No Necessity for sending to the Yukon 32

Wade, Charges against Mr. 16

Walsh, Charges Against Major 4

Yukon Railway Scheme (Mackenzie and Mann's Contract) 20

SIR CHARLES TUPPER, BART.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER'S SPEECH

— ON THE —

AMENDMENT TO THE ADDRESS

The debate in the House of Commons on the Address to His Excellency in reply to the Speech from the Throne assumed a less general character after the following amendment had been moved by Mr. E. F. Clarke, member for West Toronto:

"That this House deems it expedient to inform His Excellency that in view of the widespread charges of incapacity, misconduct and corruption in the administration of public affairs connected with the Yukon, it is the duty of the Government to appoint, without delay, an independent judicial commission to make a thorough investigation into that subject and report the result."

The leader of the Opposition, Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., addressed the House on the Amendment on April 14th. He was received with great enthusiasm on rising, and was frequently applauded during the speech. He said:

I am very sorry at this late period of the discussion to be obliged to again address the House, as they very kindly listened to me at very considerable length on a former occasion. But the matter now under the consideration of the House is of so grave a character, and has assumed an importance of such a serious description, as to make it absolutely the duty of gentlemen to give the present position we occupy very careful and attentive consideration. It will not do for hon. gentlemen opposite to pooh-pooh this question. I tell them they cannot afford to do that. I tell them that they are standing in the presence of the great intelligent electorate of Canada, and the graver the charge, the more bound they are to give it that consideration to which it is entitled. The charges are of a grave character—a most serious and grave character.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Against the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat takes the ground in this House that, no matter what may be the misconduct of an individual in an official capacity, he must go unscathed, because you cannot deal with his conduct without reflecting on his private character.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Quite the contrary. I said I thought he ought to be punished.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Private character I hold to be sacred, as much as any man in this House. I say that the man who uses his position as a member of this House to assail unnecessarily the private character of an individual, whether he is in or out of this House, commits, in my judgment, an unpardonable offence. I do not hesitate to say that. On the other hand, I say that the man who will shrink—I do not care how high the position ; the higher the position, the greater the necessity—the man who will shrink from discharging his duty to this House and to this country, in exposing wrong-doing in high places, is unworthy of a seat in this House. (Cheers.) The hon. member who has just taken his seat spoke of the address of the hon. junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), though he did not undertake to answer a line or a word of that address, as an apology for the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). No man will dare to say, I hope, in the presence of this intelligent assembly, that it was an apology. It was a vindication—a masterly vindication—of the right of every member of this Parliament to deal unflinchingly and in the most unqualified manner with the conduct of public officials, provided that conduct is of such a character as to bring disgrace and obloquy upon the country. I say, any hon. member of this House would fail in his duty, if under these circumstances he did not deal with it. So far as Major Walsh is concerned, I have no hesitation at all in saying that I listened with the greatest regret to the necessity that existed—and that necessity did exist—and was used by the senior member for Pictou for bringing that gentleman's private conduct before this House. What are the facts, Sir ? Is there any man of intelligence, in this House or outside of it—any man who honours public character and public consistency, and the proper and efficient discharge of public duty—who will say that, if a man holding a high position, the executive of the Government of the country in a great district, forgets himself and disgraces that position, it is not the duty of every man who wants to see public officials conduct themselves in a manner to entitle themselves to the respect of the country, to bring his conduct under the notice of this House ? I listened to the great encomium which the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) made in this House last night. And, Sir, I could not help feeling that, if that eulogium was deserved—and I would be glad to find that it was deserved—he is the bitterest enemy of Major Walsh, if he denies the opportunity which the resolution moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) behind me, yesterday, would afford that man of having his character completely vindicated. (Cheers.)

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, there is a very much better way. If he will make the statement outside, he will soon have an opportunity of proving it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had better be careful of such challenges as that. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I do not want to use my position in this House in the manner in which I could use it, if I were to respond to that challenge. I say, the hon. gentleman had better be careful. I would be glad to see Major Walsh

vindicated ; but when a member of the House of Commons of Canada received a visit from a gentleman holding a high position in the capital of our Empire, in London, when a member of the House of Commons has received a visit from a gentleman who represented one of the largest banking and financial institutions in the city of London, and was told by that gentleman that he went to see the executive head of the Yukon, appointed by the Canadian Government, and that Major Walsh was so intoxicated that he did not know what he was doing——

Mr. DOMVILLE. That is not true.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Silence. The hon. gentleman had better take care of himself.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I can take care of myself, and you too.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think the hon. gentleman knows how to do it after a certain hour of the day.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I might try anyhow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does that hon. gentleman consider it a base slander to vilify a man's character by saying he is drunk ?

Mr. DOMVILLE. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would he think that was a base slander if uttered in respect of himself? (Laughter.)

Mr. DOMVILLE. I certainly would, but coming not from the hon. member who is now speaking.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I see that that retort obtains an emphatic response from the hon. gentleman's associates, who, I am afraid, are many of them, responsible for the irresponsible condition in which that hon. gentleman exhibits himself to the House very often.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman will withdraw expressions of that kind reflecting on another hon. member.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the interruption of the hon. gentleman tempted me to forget what perhaps is due to the House.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, you do not know it.

Mr. CASEY. I think I know a little more about it than the hon. gentleman who interrupts me. My point of order is this : The hon. gentleman who has the floor made a most gratuitous, uncalled for, and insulting remark about an hon. gentleman who had the audacity to interrupt him. The point of order I raise is that the hon. gentleman cannot go on without making an apology and withdrawing the statement.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I ask for that.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. leader of the Opposition was making his withdrawal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sure that he will conclude with a frank withdrawal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no hesitation, Sir, in saying that I shall always bow to the Chair and conform to that rule of the House

which requires any hon. member to withdraw any expression that may be regarded as unduly offensive to another. But I hope I shall not be induced by any unseemly interruption to forget that rule. I think that hon. gentlemen would best consult, in the present condition of things, the interests of the House and the interests of the Government and of the party supporting the Government in this House, if they would allow, on a grave question of this kind, a member of this House to frankly and fully state the opinions he holds with regard to a very momentous question.

I was about to say that when a member of this House receives a visit, as the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) did, from a gentleman holding so high position as the representative of one of the largest banking institutions in London, as to induce Lord Strathcona to give him a letter of introduction to Major Walsh—I say that when the senior member for Pictou received a communication from so high a source, I hold that if Major Walsh be innocent, if there was any mistake or misunderstanding—and I am not going to say for a moment that any man is to be held guilty of anything until his guilt is proved—the member who received such communication is bound to bring it before the House. (Applause.)

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think that in making that statement, the hon. leader of the Opposition ought to give the name of the party.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There will not be much trouble in hon. gentlemen opposite finding out the name. Their own officer and High Commissioner gave that gentleman his introduction to Major Walsh, and that gentleman showed the letter of introduction to the senior member for Pictou, and said : When I took that to Major Walsh from the High Commissioner, Lord Strathcona, I was turned out of his office, the man was so drunk he did not know what he was doing.

There may be some mistake, but no man in this House could have better authority, and it became his duty to challenge the public conduct of any high official in this country against whom such a charge is made from such a source.

I regret most deeply that it is necessary to assail in any way the reputation of Maj - Walsh ; but in view of the statement placed in the hands of the senior member for Pictou by a gentleman occupying a prominent position in England—in London, New York and Canada—and of the charges involving the use by that officer of public officials in a most improper manner, I say that those who deny to Major Walsh the opportunity of vindicating himself—as I assume, and hope he will, if such opportunity be given, be able to vindicate himself completely—are his worst enemies. His worst enemy is the man who takes the position in this House that it will not do to have Major Walsh's conduct examined except by a subordinate official of this Government, who depends upon it for his existence. That is the position I take. (Cheers.)

I want to draw the attention of the House to the motion now before it, and I am very sorry to see that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is not in his place. I am not very much surprised to see the chair of that hon. Minister vacant, but I say that a Minister of the Crown, whose conduct is challenged as his is, for he is the root of the

whole offending in this matter, he is the man responsible to this House and this country for all these disgraceful scandals that are blackening the fair fame of Canada throughout three continents—North America, Europe and the great island continent of Australasia—I say that the Minister who is responsible for the appointment of the men who have brought Canada into that position should be in his place here. I wanted to address the House yesterday on this subject, but postponed doing so because I understood the hon. Minister was engaged in more important service for the Government in another place, but I am now compelled to make in his absence the remarks I intended to make, because he appears to have vacated his position in this House while his own conduct is receiving that scrutiny it is absolutely necessary it should receive. His own interests and the interests of the Government of which he is a member ought to lead him to be here to meet these statements and charges as they are made. The following resolution has been moved:—

That this House deems it expedient to inform His Excellency that in view of the widespread charges of incapacity, misconduct and corruption in the administration of public affairs connected with the Yukon, it is the duty of the Government to appoint, without delay, an independent judicial commission to make a thorough investigation into that subject and report the result.

The Urgent Necessity for an Impartial Investigation.

That is a resolution which the Government ought to have accepted at once in the interests of Canada, in their own interests, in the interests of good government and of the honest and faithful discharge of public duty. What we ask is fair and reasonable. No man in this House or out of it can deny, who knows anything of the subject, that throughout North America, Canada and the United States, throughout the British Empire, throughout every place on the continent of Europe, where that great organ of public opinion, the London "Times" is circulated, these facts are established beyond controversy, that we have placed before this House from a score of sources—not Conservative, not in opposition to the Government, but thoroughly independent, and many of them strong supporters of this Government. All this demonstrates the absolute necessity for an investigation into these charges. No person can deny that these wrongs existed. Let hon. gentlemen turn to the newspapers conducted by hon. gentlemen sitting behind them—to the Winnipeg "Tribune," conducted by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), to the Edmonton "Bulletin," conducted by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), both strong supporters of this Administration. (Hear, hear.) I could give them half a dozen other members of their press that have declared in the most outspoken manner that the honour and character of the Liberal party requires such an investigation as this. Why should they not make such investigation? Surely there is no reason why, of parties, through being remote from the seat of Government, have been led to abuse their positions, that these parties should not be punished for what they have done. It is not as though there was no evidence, for the evidence already is overwhelming. Take the former Attorney-General of Manitoba, a gentleman who fought the battle of hon. gentlemen opposite in this House with a vigour and determination never surpassed by any hon. gentleman on either side, and what is his testimony? He declares that there is a common consensus

of opinion, dot among Americans only, not among foreigners only, but among British subjects and all classes of people, who come from the Yukon territory, that public business there was conducted in a most scandalous and disreputable manner. Clergymen also declared the same thing. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), who moved this resolution, gave a mass of testimony, not from Conservatives but from Liberals, and from Liberal journals, from gentlemen of the highest standing in the clerical profession, declaring that everything in that territory was of the most rotten and scandalous description and demanded investigation at the hands of this Government. Do hon. gentlemen opposite suppose that the Minister of the Interior will be vindicated in the eyes of the people of Canada for these appointments for which he himself is directly responsible by the fact that he virtually admits his guilt ? For he does admit it, when he says that he will not permit this investigation, that he will not submit his acts to an independent judicial tribunal, that he will not permit an investigation unless we allow him to select the judge and pack the jury. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot afford to take that position. This thing has gone too far to be dealt with in such a manner. Suppose they adopt this resolution of the hon. member for West Toronto, what would be the result ? Of course, no one can suppose that it could be shown that the administration of public affairs in the Yukon had been what it ought to be. But suppose they made a report as an independent judicial tribunal would be bound to do, that there had been wrongdoing, it might be said that the Government themselves and the Minister of the Interior were not guilty of directly participating in that wrong-doing. Will that not be a great thing for the Government ? If they are in a position to defend their conduct, is there any better means of establishing the case than to go before an independent judicial tribunal and have its finding put on record ? It will enable them to deal with the guilty. If necessary, it will enable them to drive out their colleague, the Minister of the Interior, as I believe they would be compelled to do ; but the result would be to vindicate the rest of the Government. In any case, the fair name of Canada would be restored. There is no country in the world in which, take it at large, under one Government or under another, the administration of public affairs can more fairly challenge honest investigation than Canada. But the only means by which Canada can be restored to that position is by the course proposed in this resolution and by the appointment of an independent judicial tribunal to deal with the subject on its merits. Its findings would be accepted throughout the civilized world as settling the matter and setting it at rest. I do not hesitate to say that it is far beyond any party interest that the matter should be dealt with in this way. I believe there is no intelligent man in Canada who will not be glad to have such a finding arrived at as would relieve the Government of Canada from the serious imputation under which they rest at this moment. No doubt hon. gentlemen have heard how, on one occasion when that great man, Mr. Gladstone, was violently attacked by an opponent in the House, and the Speaker himself prepared a way for his vindication, he leaned back in his seat and said to one of his friends behind him : "The Lord hath delivered mine enemy into my hands." When I heard the speech of the hon. member for

Centre Toronto, though I did not say it, I felt that, so far as this Government and the party behind them in this House are concerned, the Lord had delivered mine enemy into my hands. (Loud cheers.) I wonder if the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite has been drawn to the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Centre Toronto. I wonder if they see the precipice upon which they are placed and the yawning gulf into which they must fall at no distant day if they support this resolution.

The Government Afraid to Have an Investigation Unless Conducted by One of its Own Officials.

Here is what is said:—

> That all the words after "His Excellency the Governor General" in the amendment be left out, and the following words inserted instead thereof:—
> "That we have observed with pleasure that on receipt of complaints against some of the officials in the Yukon district, His Excellency's Government took prompt action to enquire into the matter of such complaints by appointing Mr. William Ogilvie as a commissioner for that purpose. Having entire confidence in the integrity and ability of Mr. Ogilvie, we are satisfied that his inquiry will be impartial and thorough, and that it will place His Excellency's advisers in possession of all information necessary to enable them to do justice to all parties concerned."

Who is Mr. Wm. Ogilvie? Mr. Wm. Ogilvie is a gentleman with whom I have a slight personal acquaintance. All that I have ever seen of him, I do not hesitate to say, has led me to form a high opinion of him, and all that I have learned of him has confirmed me in that opinion. But, Sir, I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that however well qualified he may be to discharge the duties—as he did discharge them with signal ability—of a surveyor in that remote country, I have yet to learn that he has qualifications that would enable him to carry out such a judicial investigation and make such a report as would command either the respect of this House or the confidence of this country. He had had a valuable training as a surveyor in the field, and he was a good surveyor. Mr. Fawcett was a good surveyor, but he lamentably failed as Gold Commissioner, as I will show the House before I sit down—and I may say that I have not a word of challenge to offer as to the character of Mr. Fawcett; I believe on the contrary, Mr. Fawcett, as far as I am able to judge, has erred through want of ability to fill a position for which he was never intended and which he was unable to fill. And now to return to Mr. Ogilvie. Suppose you get a report, what value is it? If it is to be of any value, if it is to be received throughout those countries where the fair name of Canada has been smirched by these charges with which the press of those countries have teemed for over a year, I say if it is to be of any value, it must be made by a proper tribunal. The first question is, who is Mr. Ogilvie? Why, to say that the Minister of the Interior occupies such a position in this House and this country that the Government of which he is a member cannot afford to have his conduct investigated by anybody but a relative or connection of his own, and that man dependent upon the Government for his daily subsistence, is, I say, a proposition that only requires to be stated to reveal its utter absurdity. (Cheers.) If the bitterest enemy of the Minister of the Interior, if the bitterest enemy of this Government had asked them to do, that which would destroy them

in the estimation of the intelligent people of this country it would be just what they have done, appoint a man occupying such a dependent position that, however fair, however honest, however disposed to discharge his duty, he would be more or less than man, I do not resitate to say so, he would require to be more or less than man to discharge that duty faithfully if the result was to drive his principal, to drive his Minister out of his seat into private life—for I believe a judicial investigation into this matter would have that result, and I shall give the House some reasons for arriving at that conclusion.

Now, Sir, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) has talked about unsupported charges damaging the country. It is not the unsupported charges that damage the country. The press of Canada, of the United States, of Great Britain, of France, and of many other countries, as well as of the great islands of Australasia, have been full of these charges, and I say that to meet them you must have that which this amendment demands, or you are wasting your time, you are taking a course that will receive no justification at the hands of the intelligent people of Canada. The hon. member for Centre Toronto spoke of Miss Shaw. My right hon. friend, I presume, knows that lady; and I am sure that if he does, he will say that the London "Times," that great organ of public opinion in the United Kingdom, would not be likely to select a person to send here, to send to Africa, to send to Australia, at great cost, and at great personal inconvenience to that lady, unless they were satisfied, not only of her high character for integrity, but of her keen intelligence, and her ability to put before the readers of that great journal sound, substantial and reliable information. It is utterly impossible to discredit her statements. (Applause.) If you want a report that will challenge the accuracy of the statements to which she has committed herself, and which the London "Times" has endorsed, you must have an independent judicial tribunal able to sift evidence as only legal men can sift evidence; and when all the particulars are put before the country, the people will be satisfied and not before.

Mr. Sifton's Denial an Insufficient Defence.

The hon. member for Centre Toronto took great objection to the fact that the word of the Minister of the Interior was not accepted. Well, Sir, it is not usual to accept the simple word, the simple declaration of any man, however high his position, and we cannot accept the simple word of the hon. gentleman, who is charged with incapacity, and misconduct, and corruption, in regard to the administration of the territory of the Yukon. That was the charge. I say it would be asking too much of human nature to ask that the word of any man should be accepted under those circumstances, and before I sit down I shall give him some reasons why this House is not prepared to accept the unsupported word of the Minister of the Interior. (Cheers.) Then the hon. member for Centre Toronto asks: How would you organize a bank? Let me ask him a question. If he were going to organize a bank tomorrow, dealing with the enormous gold resources of that great territory, the greatest gold country to be found on the face of the globe, would he put in a surveyor as general manager? Would he select a horse dealer as an accountant? (Laughter.) Would he go and hunt

up the captain of an old whaler, as the Minister of Militia did, for the purpose of discharging the duties of which he had no more knowledge than this horse dealer in Manitoba, or this captain of a whaler, who, no doubt, had some experience of an arctic climate ? Would he put the administration of the business of his bank in such hands ? If he did, I am sure the shareholders and the directors would very soon call upon him to answer for it, as the Minister of the Interior is called upon to answer for the manner in which he has played with, trifled with, and abused the interests that were placed in his charge, and the responsibilities that were cast upon him. (Cheers.) Then the hon. gentleman says that these officials are entitled to know what the charges are. Have the Government taken the best means of knowing what the charges are ? They propose that a man placed at the head of the administration of affairs in the Yukon should call for witnesses to come forward, should send out into the woods to men that are engaged under the hardest possible conditions in earning their livelihood, and ask them to abandon their employment, to come in and to make bitter enemies of every man in whose hands they are, and who is able to destroy and ruin them. I say that is the position, and it is contrary to everything reasonable to suppose that men in that position, however deeply they may have felt their wrongs, should come forward without counsel, without direction, and place themselves in antagonism to the parties who are placed over them. Sir, I do not think that is the way to find out what the charges are. But I was very much amused with the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), who, I think, can hardly have been in this House for the past few days. He can hardly have heard the speech of the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), when he says that he objects altogether to fishing expeditions. Sir, did that hon. gentleman object, did the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), object to fishing expeditions when it was proved up to the hilt, proved under oath in the Committee of Public Accounts last year, and stated on the floor of this House, and that statement goes unchallenged, that a man who was not a member of the House of Commons at all, much less a member of the Government, had been enabled to put his unholy hand into the treasury of Canada and take out public money to pay his own private accounts ? (Cheers.) That is the position that hon. gentlemen find themselves in. That hon. gentleman who slept for many years with the Auditor General's Report under his pillow, who was hunting from morning till night for garbage to throw at the Conservatives of this country—that hon. gentleman, when that fact was brought before this House, hurled an insulting and slanderous insinuation across the House, because he knew that he had no answer to make, no vindication, that he could do nothing to defend his friend. That is the position, Sir.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman is giving a statement to this House that the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee will not support. I challenge him to produce evidence to warrant this statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say, Mr. Speaker, that I am repeating a statement made in the presence of the hon. Minister of the Interior by the senior member for Pictou, who gave evidence, gave the exact

statements, gave the sworn testimony of the lawyer employed by the hon. Minister of the Interior, which is that the hon. Minister of the Interior made that fishing expedition. It was also proved before the Committee on Public Accounts, that Mr. Sifton's private debt of $500, due to Mr. Howell for that service, was paid by the Government, and that the Minister of Justice, Sir Oliver Mowat, taxed the bill down to $300. And Sir, when I asked the question: Where is that money, I had a right to ask it just as any other hon. member in this House has a right to ask it, when it is proved under oath and proved by the sworn testimony before the committee. Although the hon. Minister of the Interior had four days of incubation over the charges which were made, he allowed that question to go by default. It is too late for the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) to tell the House that it was not proved; if it was not proved it was due to the fact that the hon. gentleman who committed this wrong against the public treasury——

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Order; order. The hon. gentleman is going beyond the question now before the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, Mr. Speaker, I am now touching a cardinal point. I am now dealing with a statement with which the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) closed his speech. He said, that the Liberal party and the Liberal members of this House would not permit wrong-doing, and he challenged fishing expeditions, and it is therefore perfectly right for me to say, that $19,000 of the public money of Canada have been expended by the Government in a fishing expedition in which they caught nothing except a ruffian who belonged to themselves.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman said to this House that it was proved in the Public Accounts Committee that a gentleman, who was not a Minister of the Crown and was not responsible to the country was able to put his hands upon $500 of the people's money and appropriate it towards paying the law expenses in connection with that investigation. When I challenged that statement as being incorrect the hon. gentleman shunted off to another subject, not daring to reiterate the statement, because the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee did not justify any such statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not surprised at the hon. gentleman's uneasiness, but he will find that he has to meet my statement when this charge was made as a contrast to the refusal of the hon. Minister of the Interior to do anything to investigate these charges with which the whole country was filled and by which the fair name of Canada has been sullied—I say that, putting that in contradistinction to the position that the hon. Minister of the Interior, lawyer as he is, when pleading his own case and endeavoring to vindicate himself, he dare not grapple with the charge, and he stands on "Hansard" to-day as having allowed the case to go by default. I want to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the present Minister of Justice has just appended his name to a declaration which puts on file, forever, the legal opinion that the whole of that expenditure was in violation of the law of the country. He has put his name to a declaration dealing with criminal justice, and this was a question of criminal justice, for the hon. Minister of the Interior was endeavoring to ferret out information that would put

these persons in the position of criminals—the Minister of Justice has put his name to a declaration that not a dollar of public money can be taken out of the federal treasury for criminal administration in any one of the provinces. Now, I am not going to take up any more time with that. The hon. member for Centre Toronto committed himself also to the opinion that Mr. Ogilvie was the best investigator, because he did not believe in lawyers. He thought that a clear-headed man was much more likely to deal with this question successfully than a man whose life is spent and whose profession involves the necessity of devoting his life to making the worse appear the better reason. Therefore, he objects to having a lawyer for the purpose. I wonder if he had learned that while listening to the Minister of the Interior attempting to defend himself with all the reasoning and all those pleas that gentlemen of the legal profession are accustomed to employ when pleading an important case, especially if they have themselves for their clients. (Applause.)

I think it will not be necessary for me to take up more time in dealing with the speech delivered by the hon. member for Centre Toronto. In moving his resolution he has, in my judgment, allowed the case against the Government he is supporting, to go by default. He has taken the position that there should be no independent judicial investigation into this matter.

Mr. BERTRAM. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain? I have not taken the position that there should be no independent investigation regarding the charges in the Yukon. But I have said, and what I say now is, that before we appoint another examining committee, we had better get a report from one that is now in existence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has taken the position that there should be no judicial investigation in the strongest and clearest terms when he made an amendment to vote down the resolution asking the Government to appoint an independent judicial investigation. The right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. gentlemen behind him will have to answer to the people of this country for standing between the Government and a judicial investigation. I will give the House some further reasons for taking the strong position I do on this question. I may say, Sir, that it is well known to members of this House, it is well known to the Government, and it is well known to the intelligent people of Canada that one of the greatest securities that the people of Canada have against the mismanagement by gentlemen who have been new to public life in the Parliament of Canada, becoming members of the Administration, is to be found in the character of our civil service It is well known, Sir, to the Government that there is no guarantee, that there is nothing that the public can have, that will inspire them with the same confidence as is reposed in the permanent civil service of England which until recently we had in Canada. (Cheers.) The difference is attributed to the fact that gentlemen were brought from outside, perhaps, for sufficient reasons to most of these hon. gentlemen—however, reasons that would induce this Government to do such violence to the standing and the character and the position of the members who for long, long years had fought their battles in this House and fought them with great ability. These men had valiantly fought the battles of the Liberal party in

the cold shades of Opposition and when they saw themselves passed over when their party was triumphant, had they not a right to complain of the absence of that recognition of public service which is usual under such circumstances. They found these gentlemen opposite raking the outlying provinces for men who had never been inside the House of Common of Canada, to make them Cabinet Ministers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) propose to go into a dissertation on the whole policy of the Government, or will he confine himself to the amendment? I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) in order?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have a word to say to that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I take the point of order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You cannot ask for the Speaker's ruling without my speaking to the point of order. I am dealing with the Minister of the Interior now; I have already shown what he did before he had any standing in public life, and I am going to show that from his very inception in public life, he has adopted a course calculated to destroy the confidence of this House in a fair and just administration by him of that great department under which the Yukon district comes.

Mr. SPEAKER. Following the precedents of the latest date, it must be distinctly held that until this amendment is disposed of, the debate must be limited to the substance of the amendment. Let us understand that to begin with. Then, with reference to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition to which objection has been taken, it occurs to me, that the position of the Minister of the Interior himself is intimately connected with the administration of the Yukon, and may be discussed. I had thought, however, before the point of order was raised, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), in discussing other Ministers and other matters of Government policy, was going outside of the debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to say a word that will, in my judgment, conflict with the ruling you have made, Sir, because I quite recognize that on the present occasion we are confined to the amendment, and the amendment to the amendment, which has been moved. Now, Sir, I will again read the amendment moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke):—

> That this House deems it expedient to inform His Excellency that in view of the widespread charges of incapacity, misconduct and corruption in the administration of public affairs connected with the Yukon, it is the duty of the Government to appoint, without delay, an independent judicial commission to make a thorough investigation into that subject and report the result.

The Spoils System in the Department of the Interior.

The amendment of the hon. gentleman from Toronto declares that we shall not have an independent judicial commission but that we shall go on with the enquiry by an official holding his office under the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). I propose to show the House the grounds on which I challenge the justice of that, and my reason for saying that, in my judgment, the Government might as well say at once:

We are in such a position that we cannot permit this matter to be investigated by anybody except a man dependent on us for his official position from hour to hour, and who is absolutely under our control. (Hear, hear.) I was going on to say that the confidence which this House and this country enjoys, in regard to new Ministers coming into the Cabinet, is based on the practice of our civil service, that they are surrounded by Deputy Heads of the departments, who have no political opinions whatever who have held responsible positions under various Administrations, who should never be changed when the Ministry changes, and who have all the knowledge and information which long years of experience in the service can give them. The Deputy Ministers are in a position, by their wise counsel and their knowledge of the affairs of their departments, to give the country the guarantee that it is not likely that anything will be done for party purposes or personal purposes that would conflict with the proper administration of public affairs.

Now, Sir, what did the Minister of the Interior do ? His first act was to violate all the traditions of the civil service law, to violate all the traditions that give security to the House and the country for an honest administration of public affairs, by degrading his Deputy Minister and driving him into an untimely grave. What next did he (Mr. Sifton) do ? There was the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, a man full of knowledge, a man in the very prime of life, a man in the very plentitude of his powers to discharge his official duties, and how was he treated ? He was put on the superannuation list, and a creature of the Minister of the Interior put in his place. I do not use the term " creature " in an offensive or invidious sense, but I say that the official who is created by another man is his creature, and I say that the present Deputy Minister of the Interior, as well as the gentleman who superseded Hayter Reid, when he was driven out of the service, are the creatures of the Minister of the Interior, who, in discharge of a debt that he had incurred in relation to these men, brought them fresh from his own county to assume the most responsible offices in the public service. Who was Alexander Burgess ? As everybody knows, he had been one of the most valued men in the ranks of the Liberal party. (Cheers.) He was taken up by the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, when he was doing yeoman service as a journalist in the cause of his party, and advanced by him from step to step in the civil service. When Sir John Macdonald succeeded to that office, although he did not retain the private secretary of his predecessor, feeling there was an incongruity in that, yet he placed him in a well-paid office. But Sir John Macdonald not only retained Mr. Burgess in his position, but when he found his sterling worth, and his ability and knowledge of the business of his office, he promoted him to the position of Deputy Minister. Sir, I say there is not a blacker spot on the escutcheon of hon. gentlemen opposite than that of driving from the position of Deputy Minister one of their own party, who they themselves brought into a position which he filled with signal ability, and the putting in his place of a creature of the Minister of the Interior from the Minister's own constituency

Mr. LANDERKIN. They all belonged to our party.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite true ; the country, I suppose, has nothing to do with it. That is just the trouble with hon. gentlemen

opposite ; they think their party is the country ; but they will awaken from that wild delusion with a very sudden shock at no distant date.

Mr. Sifton Dodging the Charges.

Nothing was more remarkable in the long and laboured defence of the Minister of the Interior, than the fact that he spent hours of his time and pages of "Hansard" in killing the dead. He found it more convenient to eulogize the character and position of officials whose character had never been challenged, than to deal with the strong challenge which had been thrown out to him with regard to other officials. Nothing, Sir, is more striking. Why, Sir, we were treated to a long discussion about Mr. Gordon Hunter, a highly respected barrister in the city of Victoria. What has that to do with the matter ? Mr. Gordon Hunter, it appears, when these men fled under the charges hanging over them, had been invited to take a very important place. He declined it, it is true ; but what had that to do with the debate ? He had not been attacked ; no person had said anything about him ; and why should the Minister waste valuable time, which was required to defend his own character and conduct, on matters of that kind ? He also spoke of Mr. Senkler. Nobody disputes Mr. Senkler's character or qualifications, or denies that he is a man of high standing. How did he come to be where he is ? Because the country rose in revolt against the mismanagement and the corrupt actions of the men who had been there before him. The charge made by the senior member for Pictou was clear and distinct It was against the first outfit, the men who had been sent into that country in the beginning ; and if ever there was a time in the history of the country which demanded that any Minister charged with the responsibility of discharging his duty to the country, should select the ablest and best men he could command for those high and important positions, it was when they were to be sent into that remote country out of the immediate reach of the head of the department. Is there an hon. member of this House who does not recognize that?

The Charges Against Mr. Wade.

The charge was that Mr. Wade's conduct in office was unworthy of his position—that he entirely failed to discharge the high duties with which he was entrusted ; and that charge the hon. gentleman slurred over by the statement that Mr. W. J. Tupper had given Mr. Wade a certificate of character. But the hon. gentleman did not read Mr. W. J. Tupper's letter. Why did he not read it ? Why did he quote garbled sentences out of it ? I will tell you why. He did it because, when Mr. Wade was appointed, he was attacked, and violently attacked, by a gentleman sitting on that side of the House now before me—the editor of the Winnipeg "Tribune," ; and Mr. W. J. Tupper's defence of Mr. Wade was in opposition So it appears that Mr. Tupper is a much higher authority with the Minister of the Interior than one of the hon. gentleman's most important supporters in this House. But this fact remains, that Mr. Wade, who seems to have some strong hold on the Minister of the Interior, was again appointed counsel for Mr. Ogilvie when Mr. Ogilvie was appointed. He was loaded down with half a dozen offices,

all of which he abused. The evidence is to the fore, and can be massed to any extent. Evidence can be adduced to show that he failed entirely in discharging his duties. In the steamer coming out, I found a gentleman who was an entire stranger to me, sitting opposite to me at the captain's table, an English gentleman, who had gone out from Moosomin to the Yukon. He had been there two years, and had been home, and was coming back; and he gave me Mr. Wade's history; and I will have no hesitation in offering to any hon. gentleman opposite my informant's name. He said: "A greater scandal could not be imagined. Mr. Wade was sent there as a Crown counsel, and he was actually in the habit of taking retainers from both sides, both the plaintiff and the defendant, and whichever side paid him the most got his services, and he threw up the retainer of the other party, and gave his advice to the Gold Commissioner, or whoever it was." And the gentleman said it was known——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman give the name?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman put it on "Hansard"?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no objection to giving the name. I have rather an objection to putting it on "Hansard," as this gentleman is at present engaged in mining in the Yukon, and, of course, occupies a delicate position; but I will give the name to the hon. gentleman, and he can communicate to him the statement I make to this House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The only reason I have for making the suggestion is that Mr. Wade's conduct is at present under investigation before a Royal commissioner; and pending the receipt of the report of that commission, the hon. gentleman does not scruple to state on the floor of this House the most serious charge that could be made against a barrister.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the hon. gentleman not hear it before?

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If that charge is true, it can be investigated now, and Mr. Wade ought to know who his accuser is.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Wade will have five hundred such accusers. It is a matter of notoriety. In that long and elaborate defence of the Minister of the Interior, which he made on the floor of this House, nothing struck my ear as more curious than the fact that Mr. Wade made a secret lease. It appears that there was no actual lease, but the business was done in a very loose way, with a mere scrap of paper—a secret lease without public advertisement or any knowledge to the community at large as to what was contemplated; and when that lease, as the Minister called it, was granted by Mr. Wade to those parties, he received a retainer of $2,500 from the men to whom he leased the property. That charge was made, and the Minister of the Interior did not question it, so far as I remember, or say a word in reference to it. Is not that quite as bad? (Hear, hear.)

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will answer my hon. friend. There was an imputation thrown out by the other side of the House, on hearsay evidence, that Mr. Wade had been guilty of some misconduct, and when challenged, the hon. member for Pictou declined to give the name of his informant.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Minister of the Interior dealt with the subject of water leases, and yet passed over the grave charge that Mr. Wade had accepted a retainer of $2,500 from the men who got the property.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman must see that the Minister of the Interior directed himself to the charge against the Administration, and answered it; but the personal charge against the probity and honesty of one of the officials is one which the official has to answer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I only say that I want to know whether the hon. gentleman is prepared to give the authorities the names of the people making this charge, or is he only repeating what the hon. member for Pictou said?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am inclined to believe that the party was misinformed, and that the fee was nearer $15,000 than $2,500, because the transaction was too big for a fee of only $2,500. Mr. Wade's whole course in that Yukon country was a most scandalous course of misconduct, and corruption, and I undertake to say that if an independent judicial tribunal is given, that will be proved up to the hilt. What more? Mr. Wade was sent back as counsel for Mr. Ogilvie. He had left there and was down here; but, Sir, when the senior member for Pictou told Mr. Wade that he was going to bring before the House of Commons his official misconduct in the Yukon, Mr. Wade made tracks out of the reach of the House of Commons, away up to the Yukon territory, and he is there to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) never did.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He says so in his speech.

The PRIME MINISTER. But he never did make a charge against Mr. Wade.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman will find a good many charges made, and it is now admitted that Mr. Wade is responsible. One of the gravest charges that can be brought against an official is that he abuses his official position to get a personal advantage for himself. Can there be any stronger charge than that? What is the charge against Mr. Wade? It is that, as recording officer, he got knowledge of where a mine was discovered, and when the party who discovered it came to have his claim recorded, Mr. Wade postponed recording it and then sent his own emissaries out to stake the property, and he divided the claim with the parties he sent out. That is the charge, and it has never been and so far as I am aware cannot be refuted. But that charge does not stand alone. Mr. Wade is charged with having consulted, throughout the whole administration of the duties of his office, his own interests and those in-

terests alone, and abundant evidence was given by the senior member for Pictou in the indictment which he made concerning the course Mr. Wade has pursued. Is it not somewhat strange that, under these circumstances, we should have an hour spent over Sinclair and Hunter and other people who had never been named and whose probity and character and honour nobody questioned, and yet that we should not have a word of vindication of Mr. Wade. (Applause.) But there is this—and it is a thing for which the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has to answer to the people of this country as well as to this House—that he himself confessed in his speech that he placed these officials in a position of the greatest temptation possible to conceive. He told us he gave these officials abundant salaries. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) said that they got very handsome salaries considering that they not only got the salaries assigned to them, but in addition their board and lodging—which I confess I was not aware of until recently, for I think it had never been publicly stated, and I assumed that they had to provide for themselves. I must confess that that makes a great difference. I admit that in so far as what are called starvation salaries are concerned, that makes a very important difference, but I may say we have had the Minister of the Interior confessing that he told Mr. Wade he was at liberty to stake out claims for himself. I ask this House whether there is a gentleman sitting on the Treasury benches who will get up and defend for a moment the position that a man sent out to that country, charged with such important official duties, in the midst of a great mass of people who went out there with their lives in their hands to struggle for a livelihood in the face of all kinds of privations and dangers, should be given the right to take advantage of the knowledge that his position gives him and use it for his own purposes. That, however, has been changed. Why has it been changed? I ask the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) if he finds that these gentlemen received sufficient salaries and provision for the duties they performed, whether that was not sufficient without the Minister of the Interior placing them in a position of the greatest temptation it is possible to conceive. Can any temptation be greater than to place a man in a comparatively humble position in life and then enable him, by abusing his trust, to make a fortune in an hour? And can it be wondered at if he should fall under the temptation? Why was that change made, as it was the other day, for it was only the other day the House was informed that that practice had been forbidden for the future. Why was it forbidden? Because the Government had learned that the country was filled with this scandal, and that it was a matter of the deepest reproach to the department and all the officials connected with it.

Now, Sir, what did the senior member for Pictou say when challenged. He said this:

> Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Wait for a moment. Candidly, I answered that I did intend to reflect on the character of Mr. Wade, and that if I were in his position, I would be on the spot.

But Mr. Wade immediately started for the Yukon, and is now in Dawson. He preferred to be under the friendly shelter of an employee of the Minister of the Interior rather than face the challenge he was informed by the senior member for Pictou would be made against him on

the floor of this House. I may say that at the very inception of his administration, the way in which he departed from all the recognized safeguards in the public interest startled us a good deal; but we were soon startled with another matter, and that was the contract for the building of the Yukon Railway. I have been taunted with having approved of that. I never did. (Applause.) What I did approve of—and I was wrong, I admit, and therefore can acquit the Minister of the Interior of being wilfully wrong and the Canadian Pacific Railway of being wrong and a great many others who got the best information—I was wrong in supposing that an all-Canadian route could be established and was to be established by the Stikine River, and therefore I do not challenge, in the slightest degree, the judgment of the Minister of the Interior in deciding on that policy But I never supported the contract. Why, when that monstrosity came down here, what did we find? We found that in that contract—and this bears on my charge of incapacity in the administration of the Yukon—which was to give to Canada, at an enormous cost to the country an all-Canadian route, contained no clause preventing its sale the day after it was signed or the work completed, in New York to foreigners.

The Premier Objects to any Discussion of the Yukon Railway Contract.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry to have to call my hon. friend to order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I am now dealing with the incapacity of the Department of the Interior in connection with the administration of the Yukon, and this is a most pertinent subject in that connection. We find that in the contract, as it was laid on the Table of this House, not only 3,750,000 acres of land, with all the mines and minerals contained therein——

The PRIME MINISTER. My point of order is this. We are now discussing the amendments moved to look into the conduct of the officers of the Government in the Yukon.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must say——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, but you are bound, before you decide, to hear my argument. Otherwise I shall have to fall back on the rules of the House. I may say at once that this point was raised when the Speaker himself was in the Chair; and although I recognize your authority, Sir, as being quite as great while you occupy his place, I think you will agree with me that some deference is to be paid to the Speaker. This point of order was raised when the Speaker was in the Chair, but when I showed him that this resolution challenged an examination into the incapacity and misconduct and corruption connected with the administration of affairs in the Yukon, the Speaker decided that I was at liberty to deal with the question of the contract.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that the Speaker ruled a moment ago that in the present discussion we must confine ourselves to the charges of incapacity, misconduct and corruption in the administration of public affairs connected with the Yukon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If I understand well what has just been said by the hon. member, I do not think it has any connection with those charges of incapacity.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I must ask that the Speaker return to the Chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He is there now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may quote to this House a decision rendered in England in 1886 on an exactly similar question. And there it was decided by the Speaker in England, Mr. Speaker Peel, that the discussion should be confined purely and simply to the question raised by the amendment. The Speaker went so far as to say this :

> That the subject of land matter will be, in some degree pertinent to the amendment, it would be more strictly in order if the debate were henceforth more strictly confined to the specific terms of the amendment of the hon. member.

I think that that shows the ruling I have given is absolutely in conformity with the decision already rendered in England.

Mr. WALLACE. Has the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) departed from that ruling ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is what I understand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must ask an appeal to the Speaker.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Speaker is in the Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then I will ask an appeal to the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) is quite in order, if he wishes to do so, in appealing from the ruling of the Chair. I do not object to the discussion, and have no fault to find with the manner in which the hon. gentleman has conducted it this afternoon. But we are here to pass judgment upon a motion made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) asking an investigation into charges of incapacity, misconduct and corruption in the administration of public affairs in the Yukon. Now, however, my hon. friend is discussing a contract entered into by this Government, which was not ratified by Parliament, and therefore never came into operation, and so can not be investigated by this commission.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to see that my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) takes so reasonable a view of the subject. But will he allow me, as a matter of some importance, to state that the greatest act of incapacity of the Department of the Interior in connection with the administration of the Yukon is exhibited, in my judgment, in the very matter with which I am dealing. And I cannot believe that this House will deny me the opportunity of stating the ground on which I charge incapacity, corruption and mismanagement in regard to the administration of public affairs in the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Does the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) intend, if the amendment should prevail and the judicial investigation be ordered, that the Yukon contract of last year is to be one of the matters to be investigated by the commission ? Otherwise his observations would not be pertinent to the issue.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That would be entirely in the judgment of the commission.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes ; if the commission is appointed, it will be appointed to investigate what this resolution covers—charges of incapacity, misconduct and corruption in connection with the administration of public affairs in the Yukon. And I do not hesitate to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if they deprive me of the opportunity of stating here and now on my responsibility the grounds for my charge incapacity in that matter, they will make a very grave mistake.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no right to speak, but, perhaps, I may be permitted to call attention for a moment to this resolution. It says :—

> That this House deems it expedient to inform His Excellency that in view of the widespread charges of incapacity, misconduct and corruption in the administration of public affairs connected with the Yukon——

this commission should be appointed. Now, certainly, anything connected with the administration of public affairs in the Yukon, the hon. gentleman has a right to speake about. But he wants to introduce into this debate a contract which is not part of the administration of the Yukon.

Mr. WALLACE. There was no contract, Mr. Speaker. There was a provisional contract made by the Government, but it could not become a contract until it was sanctioned by the Parliament of Canada. That sanction it did not receive. Here is an act of the Minister of the Interior in negotiating this contract with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. That is an act of administration by the Minister of the Interior, and I think the leader of the Opposition is quite right in commenting upon such an act of administration.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker———

An hon. MEMBER. Now we get it.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought my hon. friend had enough for one afternoon. It seems that we are discussing a question after the Speaker's decision——

An hon. MEMBER. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. FOSTER—but discussing it in an informal way ; and I suppose we all have equal rights in that respect. I am sure that hon. members on either side do not wish to cut off anything really germane to this matter so important as it is ; and I think the leader of the Government would be wisely guided if he would allow very full range at this particular time. Now, what is the amendment ? It reads :—

> That this House deems it expedient to inform His Excellency that in view of the widespread charges of incapacity, misconduct and corruption in the administration of public affairs——

Not "in the Yukon," but

> ——connected with the Yukon, it is the duty of the Government to appoint, without delay, an independent judicial commission——

And so on. Acts in the administration of public affairs connected with the Yukon may be done in the city of Ottawa. If in relation to these there is a charge of incapacity, misconduct or corruption, certainly that would justify an investigation. This does not refer simply to acts, but to officials high and low, charged with being guilty of these acts. The Minister of the Interior is not exempt. He is an official and the head official. Mr. Ogilvie is an official, Mr. Wade is an official, and all these

may be included in this resolution. Now, what my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) was attempting to prove was that the highest official of all has laid himself open to these charges against himself and his officers. Logically, it is clear that the Minister of the Interior, in all his acts, "in the administration of public affairs connected with the Yukon" is under review, and subject to criticism, and that his acts are germane to the discussion of this amendment. I think my hon. friend now would be well advised if he would not press this point of order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will be as brief as possible on this branch of the subject. But it will be impossible to deal thoroughly with the question of incapacity in the administration of public affairs connected with the Yukon without referring to this, one of the most important matters. As every person knows, the question of wood supply in the Yukon is a burning question with the mining population—a burning question in a double sense. In the proposed contract submitted by the Minister of the Interior, it was proposed to give these contractors such terms as would enable them to control not only all the gold but all the wood in the Yukon territory. Now, if there is any greater evidence of incapacity than that, I should like some person to mention it. I will not deal further with the subject than to say in passing that that was one of the first evidences of incapacity in the management of the department that met with overwhelming condemnation from one end of the country to the other. And I do not believe there is a man who is not blinded by his own party interests who would have favored such a proposition.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When did the scales fall from the hon. gentleman's (Sir Charles Tupper's) own eyes?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will tell the hon. gentleman. The scales fell from my eyes when I found the character of the proposition put before the House; when I found there was not provision for making this a Canadian route; when I found that the price proposed to be paid was so enormous as to make every person stand aghast at the idea of it. But I found that under those terms not only 3,750,000 acres but the entire gold-bearing portion of the Yukon would be absorbed. My hon. friend must not shake his head, he has asked me a question. The evidence of it was given by the Government the next day, when I showed the enormity of the transaction to this House, down came the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) with the statement that the contractors had agreed to change all that because, it seems, they could not get the hon. gentlemen behind them, ready as they are to endorse almost anything the Government proposes, to support that proposition. So I think that the scales fell from the eyes of a good many people when that occurred. Now, Sir, where was the defence for appointing this captain of a whaler, Mr. Norwood, and for appointing Mr. McGregor? Is there any defence that will satisfy an intelligent audience in this country as a ground for selecting these men for that far-off district? Why, Sir, in the province of Nova Scotia, in Ontario, in Manitoba, in British Columbia, the Government had many friends, hundreds of men capable of discharging the duty of mining inspector. Did they take any of them? Now what has become of these officials? The moment the question of this investigation was set on foot these gentlemen found

their way out of the country. I believe they were quite able to get away, but up to this hour we have never been told why a horse dealer and the captain of a whaler were selected except that they were friends of the Minister of the Interior. One of them, I believe, was recommended by the Minister of Militia and Defence, I think the Minister of the Interior stated that he owed the whaler to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence. Now what was the consequence of this sweeping away of the officials of the Department ? It is admitted that long-tried officials were displaced from that Department. What was the consequence ? We find it stated in the speech of the hon. Minister of the Interior. He says that he took office in December, 1896, and Mr. Deville called his attention, on the 5th of March, to the report that the Yukon had been neglected. Sir, if Mr. Alexander Burgess had not been degraded, if Mr. Hayter Reed had been there, if the Minister had been surrounded with the tried and capable officials that he found when he went into the department, if he had retained them, he would have had no occasion to go to the Surveyor-General for information ; his Deputy Minister would have called his attention to it long before. He has got a very smart man, I believe, as Deputy Minister. But his smartness did not take the particular form of investigating reports, as he should have done, and as his Minister should have required. Well, Sir,

Mr. Fawcett's Appointment.

Mr. Fawcett was appointed. Mark, this is the 5th of March, and Mr. Fawcett was not appointed until the 12th of April. Why this delay ? If the Yukon had been neglected, if it was necessary to send parties there, then why this delay, and why was Mr. Fawcett sent there ? Mr. Deville reported that he was a good surveyor, and I believe he was. I have stated, and I repeat, that I believe him to be an honest man, so far as I am able to judge. But there are men in the city of Ottawa who will swear before a judicial commission that Mr. Fawcett was a mere child, utterly incapable of discharging the duties of his office, and was played with as a child by these corrupt officials by whom he was surrounded. They will prove that Mr. Fawcett gave an interview to their paper—I am now speaking of the proprietor of the "Nugget."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why, Sir, has it come to this, that no man who is an American citizen can be mentioned in this House without cries of derision from hon. gentlemen opposite ? Is that the result of the six months negotiations between the commissioners of Her Majesty representing Canada, and those of the United States of America ? (Hear, hear.) Why, Sir, it amuses me to find these hon. gentlemen blowing hot and cold ; one day ready to do anything, to submit to anything at the hands of the United States, and the next day the great men of their party denounce these men the moment they come into the country. Why, they say these men are only Yankees, they are like Livernash. Well, Livernash was here ; I did not have the pleasure of seeing him, but I believe the Senate listened with attention and respect to his statements, and they found the statements of the Minister of the Interior were all astray, and that Livernash's statements were thoroughly to be relied upon. But these gentlemen to whom I refer,

although they have the misfortune to be Americans, say they are prepared to go before a judicial commission and swear that Mr. Fawcett gave an interview to them—and afterwards admitted that the report of the interview was substantially accurate—in which he disclaimed all responsibility for the officials that were under him, because, he said, they were sent from Ottawa, they were appointed without his knowledge, and he had no control over them whatever. These men state that although Mr. Fawcett was disposed, as I believe he is, to do what was right and just, he was utterly incapable. Again, they are prepared to prove that these officials, before whom the Minister of the Interior had placed opportunities of corruption by enabling them to take up claims and to undermine the rights of those who depended upon them for omical information—that these parties surrounded Mr. Fawcett and persuaded him to issue an order that no claims could be taken up for a certain period. He was asked to allow claims to be taken up in a certain district, called a section, I think, and he made an order, and then these parties got in behind the persons who had taken up claims and got them all secured, and they persuaded him that they were all wrong, that they had led him astray, that he must cancel the order, and he cancelled it, and then they came in and took up the claims. Now that is the kind of Gold Commissioner that was sent out there, a man without any qualification whatever for discharging the duties of that important position. He was trifled with in this way by officials who, it has been proved over and over again, were notoriously corrupt in every possible shape and form. Then, Sir, there is another gentleman whose name I am not able to mention, but I will say this, that when his name is mentioned, as it will be whenever there is a judicial commission before which he is called to appear, he will swear that a friend came to him in great distress saying that he had got a claim staked out, that he had got it all right, but he was obliged to leave before he could get it recorded. This gentleman was a man of standing and character, and engaged in an important work in the Yukon at the time. My informant said: You will have to do as everybody elese does. What is that? Why, he said, you will have to let it stand. The gentleman said: I must go away; I have taken my passage in a steamer, and I must leave, and I am going to be ruined because I cannot get it recorded. Go and get it recorded for me, if you can. And this man, instead of paying $17.50 as the fee, paid $40 to an official in Mr. Fawcett's department and got the claim recorded, and the man put the balance between the $17.50 and the $40 in his pocket as a bribe, and the owner of the claim went away with the record of his claim in his pocket. Now that was the position of things in Mr. Fawcett's office, and that is a position of things that demands, I think, the most thorough investigation.

Now, Sir, I want to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to Major Walsh's report, and I think I will show the House out of that, that there is very good grounds for serious criticism of the Government.

Mr. Sifton Contradicted by Major Walsh.

The hon. member for Centre Toronto wanted to know why we would not take the word of the hon. Minister of the Interior. I will give him

my reason at once. The hon. Minister of the Interior, on the discussion of the Yukon Bill last session, said, as will be found in "Hansard" of 1898, page 584:

> Somebody the other night—I think it was the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace)—in a sarcastic tone, wanted to know why Major Walsh was camped far from Dawson City? In the name of common sense, what would he be doing at Dawson City? We have forty mounted police and a sufficient staff of officials there to do the work. Major Walsh is at the place where he was told to stay, attending to the business he was sent to attend to; and when in his good judgment every provision has been made there for the purpose of meeting the emergency of that case, then, and not till then, he will go on to Dawson City to do the work which is intended to be done there.

So that according to the statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior, Major Walsh who was appointed with extraordinary powers, I do not say that they were too great, but they were enormous powers, as administrator of the Yukon, was to stay at the camp where there were half a dozen white people, at the outside, and, perhaps, twenty Indians. He was to be stranded away there in the desert, and the administration of the Yukon was to take care of itself according to this statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior. Major Walsh does not tell us that story, however, and, I may say, that Major Walsh's story, which is undoubtedly true, is confirmed now by the statement of the Minister of the Interior the other day, who gave an emphatic and direct contradiction to his statement made last year. Major Walsh says:

> When the Canadian Yukon administration party first camped at the Big and Little Salmon Rivers, it was with the expectation of proceeding by dog teams, as soon as they arrived, to Selkirk and Dawson City. On the arrival of the dog teams, which, owing to the condition of the rivers and lakes, has been considerably delayed——

There is the statement of Major Walsh that instead of being ordered to go to this place, he was ordered to go to Dawson City, and was only prevented from doing so by circumstances that he could not control. The hon. Minister of the Interior now confirms that statement, and Major Walsh gives an emphatic contradiction to the statement with which the hon. Minister misled this House at the last session. What does he say:

> I have been asked why Major Walsh did not get through by water to Dawson City. I have just given the reason. If the assistant commissioner of Mounted Police had got his supplies across in a time five times as long as it took Major Walsh and myself to put them across when we were there, Major Walsh and his party would have gone on to Dawson City before the ice froze.

So that the hon. gentleman who ridiculed my hon. friend for West York (Mr. Wallace) for suggesting that Major Walsh should have gone to Dawson City, says that Major Walsh was ordered to go to Dawson City, and was only prevented by the condition of the ice. And we have the declaration now made by the Minister of the Interior contradicting what he said to the House so long ago as last year, when he now tells us that Major Walsh's orders were to go on at once, but that he was prevented by the condition of the ice. There are two or three points in this report to which I want to briefly draw the attention of the House. Major Walsh says:

> On arrival at Dawson I found a great many questions awaiting solution which could only be disposed of by the authority of the commissioner.

So it appears that there was no such monstrous absurdity for Major Walsh to be at Dawson City. The Mounted Police were all that were required to discharge the duties of the commissioner! But Major Walsh thought differently. Major Walsh says further upon the question of royalty:

For instance, the question of royalty, over which there has been considerable discussion, appeared to be somewhat mixed. I immediately announced that royalty would be collected on all claims the leases of which were renewed subsequent to the date when the law came into force. Nearly all the leaseholders of the larger prospected claims showed a disposition to respect the collection of royalty. Others, however, were not tractable, their principal objection being that their leases were granted for one year, and that once being granted subsequent restrictions could not be placed upon them.

So that the incapacity of the Minister of the Interior again came into play by having made different arrangements with different persons in regard to the question of royalty, and having failed to bring them into operation from the time they were appointed and not from the time the parties applied.

While acknowledging the force of these reasons they submitted, that a more thorough examination of the real cost of outputting the gold would convince the Government that the royalty is a severe tax, and expressed a hope that next year would see it removed,——

Royalty, mark this, Mr. Speaker. Major Walsh declares:

——royalty was not collected from any claims which had not got into good working order or which could not show a profit after paying royalty, and this would represent a large sum.

So that a lot of regulations issued by the Department of the Interior, and administrated under this horse dealer and captain of the whaler, were allowed to be trampled upon and did not come into operation at all.

Again, more than half the leases were exempted from royalty on account of having been renewed previous to the date of the law requiring the payment of royalty coming into force. * * * The claims on this (Dominion) creek had been staked after the new regulations were in force, and should have been 250 feet in length, whereas they were staked 500 feet. After careful examination we decided to confirm the rightful staker in his claim of 500 feet.

So that we have the evidence of Major Walsh of the incapacity of the person who is in charge, who, I presume, was Mr. Fawcett, to discharge that duty.

The settling up of the claims in this way gave great satisfaction. All the remaining creek claims on Dominion and all fractions of claims were reserved to the Government.

In my judgment, one of the most striking evidences of incapacity—perhaps it would not come under the head of incapacity—but, in my judgment, it would warrant that term, is the monstrous royalty that has been charged, the oppressive conditions to which the miners have been subjected. I shall draw the attention of the House to the evidence of the truth of what I stated here last session, because every person acquainted with this subject knows that the greatest possible hindrance to the development of the Yukon has been found in these oppressive

regulations. He says—and I shall have occasion to refer to this in another connection later on—he says :

The Liquor Permits.

In two or three cases liquor was allowed to pass into the district of Dawson City by the Northwest Mounted Police at Taku under permit issued by the territorial government, subsequent to my appointment as aforesaid, but why these permits were recognized I have been unable to ascertain, they being directly contrary to instructions in this regard.

Major Walsh tells us here that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) gave him instructions not to allow any liquor to go in, under authority of the Northwest Territories Government. The Minister of Justice has told him (Mr. Sifton) that the Northwest Territories Government was authorized and could legally grant those permits, although the Minister of Justice stated subsequently—and that is a point to which attention may be drawn—that the Government still had the power to cancel these permits. Will anyone tell me that it was not the business of the Minister of the Interior in regard to such an important question as the admission of liquor into that country; will any person tell me that it was not his business to have made that the subject of discussion with the Government, and to have it fuly settled by them. A very sharp controversy occurred on this subject—and I was anxious that the Minister of the Interior should be here this afternoon so that he might hear something on this question—a very sharp controversy occurred between the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in regard to these liquor permits. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper said :

As a person was able to do in the city of Victoria, also a member of the Bar, that is, to charge and collect a fee of $500 because he was able, by telegram and by a letter, to obtain from the Minister of the Interior a permit for his client to send liquor into the Yukon.

That was the statement by the senior member for Pictou, and in reply to that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) said :

I may be allowed to state for the information of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that the statement he has made is absolutely untrue.

Now, Sir, I come to another reason why I am not able to accept the statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) again said :

The law partner of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is the only man that the public or private records of this Government can show has ever telegraphed to a member of this Government from the city of Victoria about a liquor permit.

"About a liquor permit," these are the words of the Minister of the Interior. Strange to say, after all his legal astuteness, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton), having absolutely denied the statement that a gentleman of the legal profession in the city of Victoria had received a fee of $500 for getting a permit to allow liquor to pass into the Northwest Territories ; having declared that the law partner of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper was the only person who had telegraphed to him about a permit, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton), before he sat down—as will be seen at page 875 of the "Hansard"—admitted that he had a telegram from Archer Martin, now a judge on the Bench, and then a barrister in

Victoria, asking for a permit to allow liquor to go forward for which a permit had been received from the Northwest Territories and which Major Walsh had stopped under his instructions. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) himself admitted that a member of the legal profession, to wit, Mr. Archer Martin, sent him a telegram "about a permit" for liquor to the Yukon, and the telegram is given on the pages of the "Hansard, and the answer of the Minister of the Interior is also given. Notwithstanding that the hon. Minister (Mr. Sifton) had declared that he never had a telegram from a barrister in Victoria about a liquor permit, and that the only person with whom there had been a question of permits was the partner of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, he then turned around at the end of his speech and said :

I wired this reply :

"Archer Martin, Victoria, B.C.

"This telegram will be authority to Major Steele to recognize permit to Pither & Leiser, issued by Northwest Government, to take into Yukon 2,000 gallons of liquor."

Was not that telegram "about a liquor permit," I ask the right hon. the Premier, whether one can conceive of a more unworthy subterfuge than for a Minister to use a quibble of that kind when replying to the positive declaration of a member of this House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) went on to state that under the law the Northwest Territories had issued a permit, and the Minister of Justice advised him that they were entitled to do so. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) was showing his utter incapacity for the position he occupied by issuing permits which he had no authority to issue, and by acting in contravention of the law that gave to the Governor of the Northwest Territories the power to deal with that subject. What happened ? These parties had a permit from the Northwest Government, but the authorities under Mr. Sifton would not permit that liquor to go forward, and under these circumstances the Minister (Mr. Sifton) telegraphed to the authorities under his own control to permit to go forward that liquor which had been stopped by his orders at the boundary. And yet the hon. the Minister (Mr. Sifton) tells this House that any person who stated that he had ever had a telegram about liquor going into the Yukon from any barrister in Victoria, was stating an untruth.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Would the hon. gentleman permit me a word of explanation in the matter. The expression "a permit issued by the Minister of the Interior," could only have reference to a permit issued by his own department. This telegram deals with a different matter altogether. The statement of the Minister of the Interior was that the only barrister who had telegraphed in regard to a permit was the partner of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, and it is quite sure that the Minister of the Interior did not do that in any terms of reproach to the gentleman referred to. That gentleman is a personal friend of mine, and I am sure the Minister of the Interior did not intend any reproach to him. What I wish to call the attention of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) to, is that the latter telegram had reference to a permit issued by the Government of the Northwest Territories, and the first statement of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior clearly had reference, as the text shows, to permits issued by

himself. They are two distinct transactions, and the statement made by the Minister of the Interior in the first place was amply justified.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry that any gentleman other than the Minister of the Interior undertakes to offer such a senseless quibble for the consideration of this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry my hon. friend thinks it so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is this statement true? Was the telegram "about a permit"?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I would use my hon. friend's phrase I would say he is indulging in a quibble, but that, I think, would not be parliamentary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have the whole thing out of the mouth of the Minister of the Interior himself. He says that the law partner of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is the only man that the public or private records of the Government show ever telegraphed to a member of this Government from Victoria "about a liquor permit."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). About a permit to be issued by the Minister himself.

Mr. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Not at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have already allowed the Minister of Finance to make a speech.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not made any speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I put it to my hon. friend in this House Is a telegram asking a permit to allow in liquor which was stopped at the boundary; is a telegram on that subject "about a permit" or not? And yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) for the senseless purpose of dragging in the name of a gentleman of the highest character and standing, one of his own party, one of the brilliant lights of the Liberal party in this country—the Minister of the Interior makes that senseless statement for the purpose of dragging in this gentleman's name simply because he had the misfortune to be the law partner of the hon. gentleman who arraigned the Minister for this misconduct.

Mr. McGREGOR (Essex). It was his partner (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) who drew him in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Drew whom in?

Mr. McGREGOR. Drew Peters in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How did he draw him in? The hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) before he makes these senseless interruptions should know what he is talking about.

Mr. McGREGOR. I know what I am talking about, but I do not think you do.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is unworthy the position that hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) occupies in this House, that he should interject such a ridiculous remark as that. Why, Sir, it is impossible to imagine a more complete case of persons attempting to quibble upon terms that will not admit of any quibble.

Both cases were cases of permits. The liquor was taken in under a permit sent by telegraph from the Minister of the Interior. They had

a permit from the Northwest authorities, but the liquor was stopped at the boundary, and they could not move it a particle until an authoritative permit was sent by the Minister of the Interior to allow the liquor to go forward. And yet my hon. friend is not above supporting a quibble of that kind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will have to leave the House to judge which is the quibbler.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps I might as well read what has been placed in my hands. I think it is simply contemptible to drag these private and irrelevant matters before the House. This is a telegram from Victoria sent to the "Star":

In the House of Commons, Hon. Clifford Sifton charged that Hon. Fred. Peters, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper's law partner, had applied to Ottawa for a liquor permit for the Yukon. Regarding this matter, Mr. Peters stated that he has never made an application to Ottawa for a liquor permit since he was the partner of Sir Hibbert Tupper.

So that he was not the partner of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper at the time.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

AFTER RECESS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have but very little to add to what I have troubled this House with; but I was running my eye, when the House took recess, over the report made by Major Walsh. He says:

No one here but admits that never before have we been personally present where so astonishing a state of order and safety to life and property has been maintained. It is something to be remembered and spoken of, the longest day we live.

A prominent American, resident in Dawson writing to the press said, upon the same subject:

"I wish to say, with regard to the Mounted Police, who govern the Northwest Territory under management of Major Walsh, that a more orderly and quiet camp did not exist on the face of the globe. They have complete control, and the people are high in their praise. Your property and person are safe all the time. You need have no fear day or night.

I draw attention to that with great pleasure, because it is a wonderful evidence of the result of what we may call British institutions. It shows how different a mining camp in a remote section of the country that is under the control of British power, presents to that which has been shown in other countries; but I draw special attention to it, because the hon. Minister of the Interior based his monstrous project for the building of a Yukon railway, which he submitted to this House on the absolute necessity of providing for the preservation of law and order in that country. He held out to this House the impression that, unless that enormous obligation was incurred by the people of Canada, there would be no security that this district would not be absolutely wrested out of our hands by a foreign population. All these fears, Sir, have proved entirely illusory—just as illusory as his predictions with reference to the famine and distress that would be occasioned there, if his very

extraordinary proposal were not adopted by both Houses. (Cheers.) On page 14 of Major Walsh's report will be found the following statement :

No Need for Sending Troops to the Yukon.

The Battalion.—On my arrival at Selkirk, on my trip up the river, I found Colonel Evans camped there with 60 men. The balance of his command had not yet arrived. Good progress had been made in getting out logs for the various buildings to be constructed. I informed Colonel Evans that it was more than likely that at least 100 of his command would have to winter at Dawson. Subsequently, Colonel Steele advised me that the police force at Dawson was to be increased to 70 men, and I wrote to Colonel Evans, stating that perhaps this number would be sufficient to perform the work there this winter.

I bring that forward as an evidence of the utter incapacity of the Minister of the Interior to discharge the duties devolving upon him in connection with the administration of the Yukon. The fact that we have the evidence of Major Walsh himself, who is thoroughly competent to speak on that question, that there never was any part of the world in which there was greater order and quiet than in the Yukon territory, where there was but a small number of our Mounted Police force there, whose efficiency in the discharge of their duties as Mounted Police nobody, in my judgment, can speak too highly—in the face of that what do we find ? We find this Government actually incurring the enormous expense of sending over 200 soldiers into that country, at a most frightful cost. Why, the amount which the Government paid to the Hudson Bay Company for transportation to Teslin Lake, I think, was at the rate of 40 cents per pound on all supplies and materials ; and now I ask why was this enormous charge imposed upon the people of Canada ? I have only to read the report of the Major-General Commanding the Militia, to find that this force is to be recalled, that it was, in his judgment, very inconvenient to have the military forces of Canada taken away from their duties ; and yet we find, such was the utter incapacity of the Department of the Interior, that an enormous expenditure, which must run into a great many hundreds of thousands dollars, was incurred for the purpose of sending soldiers of the permanent military forces of Canada into the Yukon. I want to know what justification the Government have for that. We have here the report of Major Walsh, whose testimony is borne out by every one who has visited that country —ladies, gentle, and simple, and everybody else—that there never was a place in the world in which there was more perfect law and order, as there has been from the first to the last, in the Yukon. Yet this Government, not content with the sufficient force of Mounted Police which they had there, incurred enormous expense and disturbed the whole defensive arrangements of Canada for the purpose of sending soldiers out there. What was the object of sending a military force into that country ? The mounted policemen, under the instructions which governed them, were able to discharge whatever duties were necessary. Soldiers can do nothing ; you must have something in the nature of a rebellion, you must read the Riot Act before a soldier can raise a finger. Yet, in the face of the evidence of Major Walsh and every other authority who has any knowledge of the country, the hon. Minister committed the monstrous folly of sending a large military force in there, at the cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars. It looks as if the

whole of the Yukon territory was to be exploited by an individual in this country for purposes which it is very hard for any person to understand. From the miners in the Yukon territory a revenue has been drawn, according to the statement made on a recent public occasion by the Minister of the Interior of $1,530,000, and the expenditure involved amounted to $647,000, leaving a balance of $883,000 placed in the treasury of Canada out of the pockets of the people carrying on mining in that far district. When one contemplates that, with the evidence before him that we now have—evidence from every source—one is at a loss to understand why the Minister of the Interior should have acted as he did.

The Yukon Postal Service Demoralised.

The hon. Postmaster General contradicted very strongly the statement that the post office regulations in that country were in a most deplorable condition. Have the men who contributed over $1,500,000 to the treasury of Canada, not a right to have their mail system kept up with the outer world ? I have no hesitation in saying that you cannot show me in the history of any country such mismanagement and incapacity as has been exhibited in that district by the postal administration of Canada. If the hon. Minister of the Interior, anxious to exploit this country for his own purpose, wished to prevent any communication with the outer world, we could understand the state of things that exist there. We could undersand why tons of mail matter were lying for months on the road, and nothing done to carry it forward, and, when finally it did arrive, the state of affairs out there simply beggars description. I can produce the sworn testimony to any extent to show that when the mails did arrive, nobody could get a letter out of the post office ; I can show that, after weary months of waiting, these men, who had put this balance of $900,000 to their credit in the treasury, were unable to obtain the slightest communication with their friends. I say that condition of things was scandalous and disgraceful, and shows incapacity and recklessness of a most startling character.

We have been nauseated with the story of the Postmaster-General's wonderful improvement in the post office. I do not hesitate to say that the postal communication in Canada has never been in a more imperfect, disrupted and disgraceful condition than under the administration of the present Postmaster General. When this great mining population putting over a million and a half of dollars into the treasury of Canada, were not afforded means of receiving communications—communications, many of them, of the most vital importance, communications sometimes upon which fortunes depended, it is a disgrace to those who are responsible. And even when the mail was received in that country, what was the result ? The fact is notorious and can be proven by the evidence of scores of the most respectable men, that when a mail arrived, the men who wished to apply at the post office for letters were lined up by the Mounted Police, and, after spending perhaps a whole night in line were unable to reach the post office, were obliged to resort to the disgraceful means of bribing women of immoral character to go to a side door of the post office, take their letters and carry them to a

restaurant opposite the post office, where, on payment of one or two or five or even as high as ten dollars for a single letter, these communications were handed over to the unhappy—or happy, for they were often glad to get their letters upon any terms—recipients. That is the state of things that hon. gentlemen opposite may think to dispose of by getting a dependent relative of the Minister of the Interior to report upon ; but it will not satisfy the public of Canada. If they want a report that will dispel the disgrace which now overshadows the fair name of Canada in the eyes of the civilized world, they must adopt different means. These are matters that are known to every person that has gone into that country, and yet with the enormous amount of nearly three-quarters of a million of money lying to the credit of these unfortunate miners, they can neither get justice in the administration of their mining claims, nor can they have means of communication with the outside world. These are thoings that the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) may think to dispose of by handing them over to Mr. Ogilvie to investigate. But such a course will utterly fail to satisfy the intelligent people of Canada that justice has been done in the matter.

Obstrnctions to River Navigation.

Now, I turn to another point. Major Walsh, in his report, says :

> This winter the channel of the Thirty-Mile River could be greatly improved by the removal of the dangerous rocks in its course. It would require very little expense to put this river in safe condition for navigation. I would recommend that attention be given this matter at once. Last winter, when I was going up the river over the trail, I noticed that the dangerous rocks were all exposed. A charge of dynamite could very easily remove them. Some dredging at the foot of Lake Lebarge at Cariboo Crossing would also improve navigation by this route. In a former report I stated that the Lewes River was not navigable, and I intimated that it could not be made navigable. I have since found that the waters of this river are very much deeper at the points referred to in my report than I was then aware, and by removing a few rocks at different places a good channel for navigation can be secured.

There is a service of the most vital and pressing character. Mr. Coste, the engineer of the Public Works Department, who was sent out as soon as the House rose last session to examine the Stikine River and Teslin Lake route, and came out by the White Pass and Lake Bennett route, has pronounced altogether against the Stikine River route. Here is a w..k that would cost, perhaps, $20,000 and would save the destruction of hundreds of thousands worth of property ; and yet the Government, with three-quarters of a million of these miners' money in their treasury, wll niot spend a paltry $20,000 or $30,000 in removing obstructions to navigation on the route that thev have been obliged to use for the purpose of keeping up their communication with that country. The Minister of the Interior declared in this House that the salvation of life and property and of the country itself depended upon the construction of the Yukon Railway. And yet, when that Bill was defeated in the Senate, what did the Government do ? Why, they put their embargo upon that country and would not allow any person to provide means of access to it. A company offered to deposit $250,000 in the treasury of Canada as a guarantee that they would, without a dollar of subsidy, without an acre of land from this Government, build railway communication to Dawson City, within eighteen months. Yet the Government

put down their foot and would not allow these men to build that railway with their own money. Under the circumstances, the least they could do was to spend this $20,000 or $30,000 to do this work, which Major Walsh declares is an absolute necessity. Up to this hour not a blow has been struck, not a tittle of the work has been done, this work which the man who was placed in the position to deal with the matter reported as being of vital importance.

Timber Leases.

What does Major Walsh say about the timber leases ? If the object of the Minister of the Interior from the day he was called to take charge of that department down to the present hour had been to exploit the Yukon country for himself and his friends, or for political party purposes, he could not have taken more effective means than he did. The country has been scandalized by these timber leases and these river leases that have been given to whom the Government were indebted for political services. What does Major Walsh say upon that question ?

> Regarding the timber of the district, a policy of extreme caution should be adopted. Without timber there can be absolutely no development in this district, and the regulations should be such as will best ensure its preservation while affording the population all that its members require for legitimate use. Timber leases should be issued from the district, and not from Ottawa.

Yet, down to the present hour, I believe, these timber leases, these river leases, these advantages and privileges have all been used by the Department of the Interior and the Government for the purpose of paying their political debts without regard to the recommendations which the gentleman placed in charge of that country and with the responsibility upon him as to the proper course, a course which every man with a head upon his shoulders could perfectly see was the only means by which this could be properly done, and that is by granting these leases in the country itself.

I draw the attention of the House again to the condemnation that Major Walsh in this report makes of Mr. Fawcett, who is vaunted so highly by hon. gentlemen opposite. He says :

> I would recommend that an assistant judge for the Dawson district be appointed, and that one of his duties be the deciding of mining disputes. I do not think any one but a lawyer is fit to try these cases.

After two years' experience of making a gold commissioner of a surveyor, and of having all these important interests depending upon his decision, Major Walsh, with the whole question, under his eyes, reports to the Goverment that if they want this thing properly done they have got to get rid of Mr. Fawcett and get a lawyer in his place who understands something of the principles and knowledge of law. I repeat that I would not say one word in disparagement of Mr. Fawcett's high moral character, and his desire to do what is fair and right ; but you have here the testimony of the commissioner himself that it is absolutely necessary, if these duties are to be properly discharged, that you should get some person else, and I am glad to see they have got some person else. Major Walsh also touches upon another very important question :

> When the difficulties of operation, the scarcity of supplies, and the lack of proper facilities for mining and the small territory worked are considered

and understood, an output of $10,000,000 is a remarkable showing, and justifies great expectations for the future. Practically Eldorado and Bonanza are the only two creeks upon which any considerable work has been done.

Yukon Development Stopped by the Royalty.

Why does Major Walsh report that there are only two places in which any work has been done? It is because, practically, Eldorado and Bonanza were two immensely rich claims about which there was no doubt of the parties succeeding in obtaining a large amount of gold. Everybody that knows anything of mining in any country in the world is well aware, and it has been dinned steadily into the ear of the Minister of the Interior ever since these regulations were made, that a more fatal policy could not be adopted than the imposition of this enormous royalty of 10 per cent. upon the output. If it was imposed upon the profits of an undertaking, one could understand it, but to impose it upon the output is a monstrous proposition unheard of in any other country of the world, so far as I am aware. In the United States there is no royalty, where they have effected such enormous results in mining development. In British Columbia, I think, the royalty is one per cent.; in Nova Scotia, if I remember right, it is something like 2½ per cent. The imposition of a 10 per cent. royalty has practically stopped the whole development of the Canadian Yukon. Why is it stopped? It is because the expenditure on ordinary mining claims is such as to make it impossible for the miners to get any beneficial results if they are compelled to pay 10 per cent. upon the outlay. The result is the greatest disaster to Canada that can possibly be conceived. Canada is interested in having credit for all the gold and all the devlopment of that country that can be produced. If you adopt a policy of 10 per cent. royalty in the first place, you make it impossible to work anything but the richest and most valuable claims; in the second place, you offer such a premium for smuggling and deception as to make it one of the most difficult things in the world to collect the revenue from the output of gold. The country does not get credit for one-half of the gold output of the country, simply because the miners adopt means to conceal the gold that they have taken out. It can be put in small bulk and easily smuggled; and the result is that, whereas, formerly everybody proclaimed what a wonderful country it was, and how successful they were, now every person conceals his output for the purpose of avoiding payment of this immense tax. The policy is one that has practically closed the great mining mart of the Yukon to mining operations, owing to the discouragement that this exaction has produced. The miner has to pay a mining license, a heavy charge; he has to pay an annual lease, a heavy charge; then you come down upon him, and in many cases, as parties have assured me, where they have taken $20,000 or $30,000 worth of gold in the course of a year, the cost of the purchase of the mine to begin with, and the expenditure involved in securing that revenue, are such as to leave them practically, after the Government take that 10 per cent., without any profit in the operation. If the Government do not get it, it is because the inducement to smuggle is so great that the miners conceal the amount they have received and thus defeat the object of the Government. Major Walsh also refers to the matter in another place:

The cold and inhospitable climate, combined with the expensive and hard labour attendant upon mining in that country, will always make it an unpopular and unfavorable "mining camp," and for this reason the mining laws and regulations must be liberal, so as to attract and encourage the population and capital of the world. Good facilities for communication and transportation must be provided in the district.

* * * * * * * *

The price of labor will be so reduced that wages can be made in ground that will pay the miner from $5 to $10 per day, and when this is done the Yukon district ought to give to the eastern provinces a trade that in a few years would exceed that of any foreign nation.

I draw the attention of the Government to this, as I regard it of vital importance. I regret to see that the Minister of the Interior has determined to maintain this royalty of 10 per cent. A gentleman called upon me, a very inteligent man who has, however, the misfortune to be an American, and, therefore, the very mention of his name will be scouted by hon. gentlemen opposite to whom that nationality have recently become so exceedingly distasteful; but he is well qualified to express an opinion, he is engaged in mining there now. He called upon me and told me that he discussed the matter with Mr. Ogilvie, and Mr. Ogilvie stated in his judgment the Government would get more money with a royalty of 2½ per cent. per annum than with a royalty of 10 per cent. There is another point upon which I will quote from Major Walsh, but here, I fear, nobody will agree with him. He says:

With regard to the question which has arisen as to the propriety of an official taking up a claim in the district, I fail to see any reason for not permitting him to do so, nor any reason in which the public or the public service can be thereby injured.

Bribery of Officials.

I am not surprised to hear that statement from Major Walsh, but I am surprised that a gentleman having the responsibility of the Minister of the Interior upon his shoulders, should have given countenance to an act so utterly fatal to anything like good government in that country. Sir, there is a gentleman within the sound of my voice at this moment. He is unfortunately an American; he comes from the state of New York. I do not intend to name him, because I do not want to embarrass him in his communications with the Government. He has not been in the Yukon, but he has a large amount of capital there, and has representatives in the Yukon territory, and he says that the only means of accomplishing anything there is the bribery of officials. The hon. Minister of the Interior will be able to learn this from the gentleman himself if he will grant him an interview. So far, he has unfortunately received the cold shoulder, and he finds it difficult to get any communication with this hon. gentleman who seems to regard the Yukon as his private and personal property. I draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to this as another evidence of what has been going on in that country, and, if a judicial commission is granted, evidence will be put before it of the fact, of which I am speaking, that the only means of accomplishing anything is by bribery and corruption, and that it is only by those means that any record of claims can be got, or any kind of justice obtained in that territory at the present time. I give another evidence

from Major Walsh's report as to the unwisdom of this enormous charge of 10 per cent. in royalty. He says :

> The cost of prospecting a claim may be any way from $500 to $2,000, and even five times as much as the latter amount has been expended in prospecting claims which are now abandoned. Perhaps with cheaper labour they may be worked at some future time.

I give that as another evidence of the absolute necessity of looking into this matter. I do not require to detain the House any longer with this interesting report of Major Walsh, but I commend it to the careful consideration of hon. gentlemen as being worthy of their attention.

A Remarkable Permit Granted by Mr. Sifton to his Former Partner.

When the House rose at six o'clock, I was dealing with a very important question in which I gave a reason to hon. gentlemen why I could not accept the unsupported word of the hon. Minister of the Interior in relation to the question of a permit. I will now give a further reason why I thought I would be justified in refusing to accept that hon. gentleman's statement. We have a very interesting account from the hon. Minister of the Interior of his own partner not Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper's partner, but his own partner, and it is worth the attention of the House. He says :

> A gentleman there named A. E. Philps, was a junior partner in my office.

That is at Brandon.

> This gentleman, like a great many others, caught the gold fever, the Klondike fever, last year, and went out to the Yukon.

When did he go to the Yukon ? He went to the Yukon when his partner became the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. DOMVILLE. That is not correct.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. However, the fact of him being the former partner of the Minister of the Interior put him in a position to do what no other man could do. The hon. gentleman says :

> I defy any man living to bring the slightest evidence of the truth of any such statement. I dissolved partnership with Mr. Philps when I became a member of the Government, and have had no business connection with him, directly or indirectly, in any way, shape or form, since that time.

That is very strong language and very clear, but the fact that he could proclaim himself as having recently been the junior partner of the hon. Minister of the Interior would be no mean advantage to him in the way in which matters have been carried on in the Yukon territory. But I am now going to show the House what I think will be strong evidence that this former partnership is still a bond of affection existing between the junior partner, Mr. Philps, and the hon. Minister of the Interior, notwithstanding the statement that he defies anybody to prove that he is in partnership. It is not very easy to prove a connection of that kind, but if anything would prove it, it is what I am going to put before the House, and it goes to show that, while ostensibly the partnership may be dissolved, that their position is what it has been before, that is to say, that they are immediately interested in undertakings connected with exploiting of the Yukon territory. He says :

> The story was circulated at the coast that I had given Mr. Philps a liquor permit, and that he had taken liquor into the Klondike, and with that

charity which covers a multitude of sins, the story was industriously circulated that I was his partner in connection with the taking of liquor into that country. Well, Mr. Speaker, he never had a liquor permit from me or my department, directly, indirectly, or in any way, shape or form, by or under the authority of any member of this Government.

That is a pretty statement. But did he give Mr. Philips what it is charged that he gave him? On page 877 of "Hansard," the hon. Minister of the Interior says he wrote this letter:

This will introduce Mr. Philps, who will be permitted to enter the Yukon district with such provisions he may choose to take with him, without regard to the regulations.

Now, Sir, if his colleagues, for I cannot believe that they were conscious of such a transaction as this, know that he is not connected with Mr. Philps, I want him to produce such a telegram as that to any other man living. I want him to show any single case in which he authorized anybody to take provisions without regard to limit or to quantity or kind, or to regulations into that country. He says: I command you as my officials to allow that gentleman to take into the Yukon territory whatever he may wish to take in there in the shape of provisions without any regard to existing regulations. I ask the right hon. First Minister whether he thinks that any member of this Government, or any man in any department of government, ought to be permitted to give a certificate of that kind to any man living. I do not believe that he would sanction such an action. How was that sanction used? I have the evidence—I do not intend to give the name—but I am going to read a letter, sent by a gentleman whose name is withheld to the "Mail and Empire," and I may say that that gentleman, although I have withheld his name is willing to go before a judicial commission and swear to the truth of what I am stating. He is known to every member of this House to be as respectable as any man within the walls of this House. I say that on my own responsibility. What is his statement? It is this:

——, October 4th, 1898.

W. H. Bunting, Esq.,

"Mail and Empire," Toronto.

Dear Sir,—When in Victoria, B.C., in June last, a gentleman introduced himself to me, and in substance said he had a permit to take a large quantity of liquor into the Yukon district, and wanted to know if I knew a certain distiller. I replied in the affirmative, and wished to see before taking hold of the deal in any way, the bona fide nature of the transaction. A telegram was sent at my suggestion to Victoria, where the original order or permit was held; an answer came back, which I saw, stating that the original, signed by Clifford Sifton, could be forwarded by next steamer if necessary. The party in whose favor the permit was, was Mr. Philps, partner of Clifford Sifton, of Brandon. I asked who was interested in the matter beside the party who offered it to me; he said that Philps was to receive $5,000 in cash when order or permit was handed over, and one-third of the profits at the end of the deal. I then would have nothing to do with it; did not think seriously of having anything to do with it at any time.

Here is a copy of the order, as offered to me, and that copy of the order, signed Clifford Sifton, is exactly what we have under the Minister of the Interior's own hand, as the permit he gave to Mr. Philps to take this liquor in:

Ottawa, 13th May, 1898.

To the Officers and Officials in the Yukon Territory:

This introduces Mr. Philps, who has a permit to enter the Yukon district

with such provisions as he may see fit to take with him, without regard to the usual regulations.

(Sgd.) CLIFFORD SIFTON.

This was presumably signed by Clifford Sifton, the original I did not see.

Well, we have the original here, and that is exactly correct.

I have in my possession a letter from the party who originally offered the deal to me, dated the 28th June, 1898, wherein he says, amongst other things, to me :

" You may have this in its entirety for $10,000."

Only $10,000, Mr. Speaker, on this little job.

You may have this in its entirety for $10,000 cash ; if you want to work on it wire me at once. I have secured the thing out and out, owing to my inability to dispose of it, and he retaining the interest.

Sir, I give that to the House as another reason why I do not accept the statement of the Minister of the Interior, that he has no connection with the party to whom he would give such a monstrous permit as that, to take in anything, without regard to regulations, and violating the laws under which the department acts, for the purpose of giving that to Mr. Philps which no other man has ever received before or since. That is a transaction that I place before the House as testimony, as conclusive as it is possible to present, of the incapacity—I won't even say, incapacity—but of the corruption of this whole transaction. I do not intend to detain the House at any further length, except to draw attention for a moment to the commission to Mr. Ogilvie issued by the Government. Sir, is this a commission calculated to meet the widespread charges of corruption and mismanagement in connection with the Yukon, as detailed in this amendment by my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) ? It is not. A number of miners sent a letter to the Prime Minister, making certain charges, and Mr. Ogilvie is appointed to investigate these charges, nothing more, nothing less. But Mr. Ogilvie, under his instructions, is not in a position to deal with anything outside of the specific charges contained in the miners' petition. The instructions to Mr. Ogilvie have been given to us by the Minister of the Interior, and here they are. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) said :

Here is the letter I wrote to Mr. Ogilvie accompanying the commission and containing his instructions :

Ottawa, 10th October, 1898.

Dear Sir,—You will receive herewith a commission to investigate charges which have been made by a miners' committee against the administration of Government affairs in the Yukon district. This commission has been issued in consequence of the receipt of a formal complaint, a copy of which is attached to the commission. You will proceed at once upon the receipt of the commission with the investigation, and you are authorized to notify the persons who have signed the petition, wherever possible, of the time and place and when the commission will be opened.

Mr. Ogilvie is simply authorized to notify a dozen miners who signed this petition, and who may be away in the woods or in far-off districts, prosecuting their employment.

It is the desire of the Government that the investigation should be thorough and complete, and that each and every charge that has been made in the miners' petition should be thoroughly investigated, and that you should make a definite report.

The Government's Investigation a Farce.

Nothing more than this. It is a farce. (Applause.) It is no answer to the charges which are ringing over three continents, of incapacity and mismanagement and corruption in regard to the Yukon administration. This commission limits the whole thing down to what a few miners have put in their statement, and these miners, when the commission opens, are, at their own expense, to maintain themselves, and to abandon their work, and to incur the undying hostility of the Government. Is this House, composed of intelligent business men, to be deceived, and deluded, and fooled, by such a proposition into believing that such a commission will dispel the dark cloud of disgrace that has settled down upon the fair land of Canada in connection with these Yukon charges ? (Hear, hear.) I am astounded, when I look across the floor of this House and see my right hon. friend, the First Minister ; I am astounded that he did not, the moment this resolution was tabled, at once rise in his place and say : I know that the conduct of my Governmen is clear ; I know that our course will challenge investigation ; I am not afraid of the administration of the Minister of the Interior being examined with the most scrupulous care, and I at once accept the proposal. And, Sir, what was that proposal ? It was not that we should name the commission, but that the Government themselves should select a judicial commission on their own responsibility, a commission beyond the control of the Government of the day. They had the whole judiciary of Canada to select from ; they could choose their own friends there, if the liked, and, so far as I am concerned, such is my respect, such is my confidence in the high character and integrity of the bench of Canada, without respect to what political party a judge may have belonged to before he went on the bench, I say, that the verdict of such a judicial commission would, in my judgment, meet with hearty approval by the people of Canada. Was not that a fair proposition for us to make ? (Hear, hear.) Why did not hon. gentlemen opposite accept it ? Why is it that they cannot find men behind them in this House who will force them to accept that proposition ? Sir, in view of the disgrace that rests upon Canada on account of these world-wide charges, the Government, out of respect to what they owe to Canada, and to themselves, should of their own motion take the best means of dispelling that cloud and of proving whether these charges are true or false. The Government should have said : We are determined to probe to the bottom this matter, which strikes at the integrity of Canada, and let the wrong-doers take the consequence. They might lose the Minister of the Interior—I believe they would by the report of any judicial commission, choose it as they might—but, Sir, the Government would save themselves. (Cheers.) Sir, in what position are they now, and in what position do they place their followers behind them ? Had they granted such a commission, whether the charges were found too true or not, it would have disposed completely of any suspicion of complicity on the part of the Government. I say to these gentlemen on the Treasury benches : You have no choice. You have to accept that resolution, and appoint that judicial commission, and you have to show that you are not in the deplorable condition that you are forced to appoint, as a commissioner to investigate charges against

the Minister of the Interior, and the Government of Canada for maladministration in that country, a man who was a dependent relative of the Minister of the Interior who is accused. Was ever in a civilized country such a thing heard of that when a man was charged with high crimes and misdemeanors, charged with failing in his duty to his country, charged with a course which involved the Government of which he was a member in disgrace? I ask, was ever such a thing known in the civilized world before as to allow the man so charged to say: "I cannot permit that charge to be investigated by an independent judicial tribunal; I must have my relative, my dependent, for my judge, or I will leave your Government," (Applause.) Sir, I tell them that they have got to take that resolution; they have got to adopt that resolution. They have got, in defence of that country, of themselves, and of their own honour, to adopt it, or they will be placed in this position, that as they can only obtain a subservient report from a man who is dependent upon themselves—and his own position makes it impossible, unless, as I said before, he were more or less than human, for him to discharge his duty independently—they will find that they have rung the deathknell of this Administration, and the intelligent people of this country will rise in their might and strike down the men who are unwilling to have their acts submitted to an independent judicial tribunal, because they know that it would involve them in disapproval and disconfiture. (Loud Cheers.)